

REMARKS

Claims 17-18 and 20 are not mentioned in the Office Action; clarification of their standing is requested. Claim 17 is amended herein, but only to be more concise.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 3, 4, and 13 are rejected as indefinite based on the use of the word “substantially”. Applicants cancel claims 3, 4, and 13 herein; however, the limiting language of claim 13 is moved into the independent claims to more clearly identify the invention, as discussed below. Applicants do not acquiesce as to the indefiniteness of the word “substantially” with respect to claim 13.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12-13, 19, 21-22, 26, and 30 are rejected as anticipated by Qureshi. Claims 27-29 are also evidently rejected in paragraph 5 of the Office Action. In response, Applicants amend claims 1, 5-8, and 28-30 herein to more clearly identify the invention, and cancel claims 2-3, 12-13, 22, and 26-27. The rejections of claims 1, 19, 21, and 28-30 are respectfully traversed, as will be explained below.

Independent claims 1, and 28-30 are amended herein to more clearly define the summary view element of the invention. As detailed in the drawings (Figure 1, element 102) and specification text, “the summary view is transparent to be as non-intrusive as possible...” (page 6 lines 13-14). “Summary view 102 comprises a substantially transparent region that overlays current slide 104 but does not significantly impede viewing of current slide 104.” (page 10 lines 14-15). “Invocation of summary view 102 by the presenter is not intended to

significantly detract from the attention paid to current slide 104 by an audience.” (page 11 lines 3-4). Thus, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art by examining the drawings that the summary view includes elements (e.g. cells) that are not entirely transparent.

The present invention is distinct over Qureshi in its use of the summary view in a single graphical user interface, not a plurality of graphical interfaces as Qureshi requires. See for example paragraph 1 lines 15-19 “...using at least two displays or monitors, one display with controls and viewing panes that the presenter alone can see, and a second display that the audience sees. Consequently, the presenter can control the specific aspects of the slide show from the private monitor or display.” Qureshi is replete with language describing the need for multiple displays (paragraphs 14, 48, 51, 53, claims 1, 14, 18, 20, etc.). With the substantially transparent summary view, the present invention is not so limited.

Regarding claim 19, the cited prior art is silent as to the use of a hierarchy of sequential arrangements of cells to depict an increased number of slides. Only one line of thumbnails (which are distinct from cells) is taught by Qureshi, while the present invention may employ a hierarchy of cells as described in the specification on page 11 lines 14-16.

Regarding claim 21, Qureshi does not employ cells, but instead persistently displays a line of thumbnails in the graphical user interface used by the presenter. The use of thumbnails instead of cells clutters the interface such that multiple interfaces are needed by Qureshi. In contrast, unobtrusive cells in the present invention enable use of a single interface; brushing a cell causes a thumbnail to be portrayed by the summary view. See page 15 lines 3-17 of the specification.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 4 is rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi. Applicants cancel claim 4 herein.

Claim 9 is rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Fiveash. Fiveash and the present patent application were, at the time the invention described in the present patent application was made, owned by IBM Corporation. Fiveash is thus disqualified as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the rejection is overcome. See MPEP 706.02(l)(2). Nonetheless, Applicants cancel claim 9 herein.

Claim 10 is rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Power Point. Applicants cancel claim 10 herein.

Claim 11 is rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Blades. Blades and the present patent application were, at the time the invention described in the present patent application was made, owned by IBM Corporation. Blades is thus disqualified as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the rejection is overcome. Applicants amend claim 11 herein to be more concise and to depend on claim 8. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and note that Blades teaches a scheme for altering data values by resizing histogram bars, but neither Qureshi nor Blades teaches nor suggests displaying slide presentation time data in a histogram as taught in the present invention and claimed in the present amendment. As detailed in the specification in Figure 5, on page 7 lines 9-10, page 10 lines 1-2, page 16 line 17 to page 17 line 7, the histogram may be employed to help split slides or otherwise reorganize a presentation.

Claims 14-16 are rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of MP7. Applicants cancel claims 14-16 herein.

Claim 23 is rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Bretschneider.

Applicants cancel claim 23 herein.

Claims 24-25 are rejected as unpatentable over Qureshi in view of Logan in further view of Bretschneider. Applicants cancel claims 24-25 herein.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been carefully considered. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Dieberger et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364